



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

life, with its force and laws of sin, is gradually brought under the higher power of the supernatural force of the Holy Spirit, which is destined ultimately to come into supreme control over the whole man, through the fostering stimulus of the means of grace—especially through prayer, the Word of God, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The present process, however, is one of struggle and conflict, and is that which is specifically presented to us in the passage of Romans at the basis of this discussion.

It is in the exegesis of this passage that the merit of the book largely consists. The thought of the discussion which follows it is not specially new; its statement is somewhat repetitious, and consequently tedious in following out; while its spirit is wholly confessional. To those who share this spirit it may be interesting; to others, hardly so.

M. W. JACOBUS.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Hartford, Conn.

---

DIE FRÖMMIGKEIT DES MENSCHENGESCHLECHTS IM LICHT DES CHRISTENTUMS. Eine religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchung. Von KARL HAUG, Pfarrer. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachfolger (Georg Böhme), 1898. Pp. viii + 336. M. 4.50.

THE idea of this book is a good one. The comparative studies of religion which we have had heretofore have dealt with its external manifestations, approaching it as mythology, as ritual, or as theology. But it must be evident that the essence of religion is in the life of man, either as an experience or as a motive to conduct. It is this religion in the heart—*Frömmigkeit*, for which *piety* seems hardly an adequate word—which our author takes as the subject of his essay. We might formulate his plan in the words: a comparative study of the religious life.

Unfortunately the execution falls far behind the promise. In fact, the author gives us an apologetic argument for the Protestant theory of the religious life. He traverses the whole field of religious history with this Protestant (or, more specifically, Lutheran) standard in his hand. He applies his measure to all forms of piety and finds them all lacking. The only true piety is this; all others are false or defective.

A brief introduction defines the nature of Christian piety (I use this word for convenience) according to the New Testament Scriptures. The Scriptures are in perfect agreement, and according to them all Christian piety consists in "a personal relation to a personal, supramundane God on the ground of the self-manifestation of this God, who has revealed himself in the Old Covenant, but especially in Jesus Christ, his only son. It is not only a subjective condition, a feeling—whether one describes this as a feeling of dependence or of freedom—but an actual living communion with the living God" (p. 22). This definition is followed by a discussion of heathen piety. We suspect that we shall hear nothing favorable because the emphasis laid upon an *actual* living communion in the sentence just quoted indicates that other so-called communion with God is illusory. This is what we find to be the case. In contrast with the living, personal, supramundane God of the Christian, the heathen divinities are the product of the human fancy or imagination. Not that there is not a slight basis of truth at the bottom of the religious perception. Man has a dim consciousness, an indefinable feeling (*Ahnung*), of a higher power, on which he is dependent and which stands in some relation to him. But this feeling is powerless to produce anything worthy of the name of religion. "The heathen gods are, according to the prophetic conviction, *Elilim* (Nothings), to which there is no corresponding reality; or, if there be such, it is demonic or devilish" (p. 30).

If, now, the heathen view of the gods is based on imagination, the heathen piety is equally illusory. In fact, on the side of feeling, all piety outside of Christianity (and a good deal inside of Christianity) is *enthusiasm*, that is, fancied communion with a god who has no existence. "Man imagines by lifting up his soul, by excitation of feeling, to reach communion with the divinity. Presupposed is the conviction that man is related to the divinity, or even that he is a divine being who is capable of communion with the gods" (p. 46). The effort of the devotee is to induce this feeling by contemplation, by fasting, by means of drugs. The phenomena are similar in all religions. The author, with the help of Chantepie de la Saussaye, examines the religions of India, Persia, Greece, and Rome—always with the same result.

But there is another side to piety. Religion is not exhausted in feeling, but calls forth activity. Men are not content to come into communion with the divinity; they wish to earn his favor. Hence the various actions of which piety is fruitful. The most widely

observed of these is sacrifice, but we find also prayers, vows, self-castigation, self-mutilation, observance of rules, ritual or moral. Dr. Haug classifies them together under the head of "Ergismus"—work-righteousness, shall we say? The point which interests us is that this side of piety is as vain as the other. Both enthusiasm and "ergism" are sheer illusion. Neither one is found in pure Christianity. Neither in the synoptic gospels is there anything ergistic, nor in the gospel of John is there anything enthusiastic. "In Jesus and the apostles there is essentially no trace of enthusiastic or ergistic religiosity" (p. 139).

The most melancholy thing is yet to come. This false piety, consisting of enthusiasm and ergism, has constantly invaded the true religion. Not only the monotheistic religions (Judaism and Islam) have been its victims, but Christianity itself has suffered. The history of the church between the time of Paul and the time of Luther is a sad record of backsliding and corruption. Enthusiasm and ergism meet us at every turn. Nor are they less powerful since the Reformation. Not only is the Roman Catholic church their incarnation, they have shown themselves in all parts of Protestantism. Pietism, the Moravian brotherhood, Methodism, Anabaptism, the Salvation Army, the High Church movement—all testify to the conquering power of these deadly forces, hostile to true religion. Three-fifths of the book are taken up in tracing this sad picture.

Is this sad picture a true picture? Looking first at the history of the church, we must say that the author's view is at least one-sided. We will, of course, accept his definition of religion (or piety, as he calls it). It is filial communion with God through Christ. But does not this communion take place in all branches of the Christian church? It seems very bold to deny the reality of communion with God in a pious Russian peasant, in a saintly Roman Catholic, in a devoted Moravian. Yet all these fall under the author's denunciation of enthusiasm or ergism.

If this be so, can we hesitate to go farther? God has not left himself without witness to the heathen. Is it possible that, outside Christianity, there has been found no believing heart to recognize this witness and to respond to it? The fact that our author recognizes a true, though dim, consciousness of God in the hearts of all men should give him pause. It is irrational to suppose that everywhere this consciousness becomes false so soon as it develops into a more distinct faith in the Godhead. In fact, the faith of the Christian is this same feeling taking concrete form on contact with the historical Christ.

"God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him." It is astonishing to see Christian ministers ignoring so broad a statement, and so unmistakable a statement, made by a New Testament writer. The fear of God and the working of righteousness here spoken of are precisely the heathen enthusiasm and ergism so impugned by our author. The New Testament writer recognizes them as the same in kind with the faith and obedience of the Christian.

Only on this basis can we have a science of religion. The dim consciousness of God in every human soul is the basis of all religious feeling. It is awakened to greater or less distinctness by events or experiences in which the soul discovers the presence of God. In these events and experiences God does reveal himself to man. But the revelation is not equally clear in all these events—in none is it so clear as in the person of Jesus Christ. But there is a real unity underlying the various forms of religious feeling. The intellectual treatment of the revelations is, indeed, often imperfect. Men have low, sensual, grotesque conceptions of what God is. But this does not nullify the underlying unity. The Christian's faith is one form of the enthusiasm or mysticism found in all religions.

In like manner Christian morality is one form of the "ergism" which is as widespread as mysticism. Faith produces obedience. It is impossible for a man to have the most imperfect consciousness of God without having at the same time a desire to do the will of God. Here again the intellectual interpretation of the phenomena is often imperfect. Men's ideas of duty differ as widely as their conceptions of God. But obedience to what is conceived to be the will of God follows communion with God as certainly as the tides follow the moon. The misguided intellectual apprehension does not invalidate the unity of motive. The Christian has the greatest amount of light on duty (as he has the greatest amount of light on the nature of God) in the life of Christ. But in its motive his obedience is not different in kind from the heathen "ergism."

It will be evident to the reader that I do not take this book seriously as a contribution to the science of religion. Neither do I take it seriously as a contribution to Christian apologetics. The author is biased by a foregone conclusion, so that he is incapable of doing justice to any person or any communion outside his own church. No doubt his intention is good. He desires to defend the faith once delivered to the saints against the assaults of the new-fangled science of religion.

A warm heart for his own flock is shown by many a turn of homiletical language. But he will convince no one who is not already on his side.

The point of view may account for the author's serious misrepresentation of Baptist Christianity on pp. 255 f. In general, as will be inferred from what is said above, he shows little sympathy for any form of Christianity other than the Lutheran. His language is often rhetorical rather than accurate, and he is not always consistent with himself.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE,  
Amherst, Mass.

MICHAEL. Eine Darstellung und Vergleichung der jüdischen und der morgenländisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael. Von WILHELM LUEKEN, Lic. theol. in Oldenberg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. x + 186. M. 4.80.

THIS book was called forth mainly by two statements by Bousset, of Göttingen, found in the latter's book *Der Antichrist*, viz.: (1) that it would be an interesting task to bring together the speculations of late Judaism regarding the archangel Michael, and (2) that, after such a task has been performed, it would probably be found that the development of the doctrine of Christ was to a large extent influenced by such Michael speculations.

Our author soon found that the first statement was rather behind than beyond the truth. But as to the influence of Jewish speculations concerning angels upon the Christology of the early Christians, he has discovered fewer proofs than he set out to find, and confesses disappointment at the results reached, notwithstanding the interesting parallels found by him.

The work falls into two parts. In the first "Michael in Jewish Tradition" is treated. The second takes up "Michael in the Tradition of Eastern Christendom." The arrangement is natural. We are told what the Jews thought of angels in general and of Michael in particular. Then we are told that much of this was taken over by Christians belonging to the eastern church. Owing to lack of space, a like discussion for the western church could not be taken up thoroughly. The author uses the best available sources, and recognizes the limitations and the frequent untrustworthiness of Jewish compilations. But apparently